

RD4



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,951	01/17/2002	John R. Hind	RSW920010122US1	1746

7590 08/10/2004

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
 IBM Corporation T81/503
 PO Box 12195
 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

BETIT, JACOB F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/051,951

Applicant(s)

HIND ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob F. Betit

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 26-50, 53-78 and 81-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 24, 25, 51, 52, 79 and 80 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 6, 33, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6, in lines 2-4; claim 33, in lines 3-5; and claim 61, in lines 2-3 recites the limitation “a secret key represented as a hash of the received user identification concatenated with a hash of the received identifier encrypted with the received pass phrase”. It is unclear from reading the claim what part of the data structure is being encrypted and when the encryption is happening (i.e. with the received identifier before the hash, with the received identifier after the hash, or with the concatenated hashes of the user identification and the received identifier).

3. The following is a quotation of the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Subject to the following paragraph, a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.

4. Claims 13, 40, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, fourth paragraph, for not incorporating all the limitations of the claims on which they depend.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository”. This limitation is worded as though “updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user” was never claimed in claim 1 on which this claim depends.

Claim 40 recites the limitation “storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository”. This limitation is worded as though “updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user” was never claimed in claim 28 on which this claim depends.

Claim 68 recites the limitation “stores the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if the meta data collection does not exist in the local repository”. This limitation is worded as though “updating the local repository with at least one of the segments from the central repository to produce a meta data collection associated with the user” was never claimed in claim 55 on which this claim depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884).

As to claim 1, Dedrick teaches a method of managing meta data using a central repository at a central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by a computing device through a communications network (see abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

connecting to the central repository through the communications network based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

utilizing, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

As to claims 2, 29, and 56, Dedrick teaches further comprising the step of:

Art Unit: 2175

uploading any new segment from the computing device to the central repository at a predetermined time (see column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 3, 30, and 57, Dedrick teaches further comprising the step of:
incrementally uploading any new meta data generated during the current user session from the computing device to the central repository (see column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 4, 31, and 59, Dedrick teaches wherein the connecting step includes:
receiving, by the central repository subsystem, authentication information from the user (see column 20, lines 10-15);
verifying validity of the authentication information (see column 20, lines 14-17); and
notifying the computing device that the user has proper authority to access the central repository if the authentication information is verified as valid (see column 20, lines 20-24).

As to claims 10 and 37, Dedrick teaches wherein the utilizing step includes:
retrieving, using heuristics algorithms, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for a current context of using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12); and
applying the retrieved meta data in the current context (see column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claims 11 and 38, Dedrick teaches wherein the current context includes at least one of the following:

opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a computer file, or executing an application program (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 23).

As to claims 17 and 44, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and the applying step includes: automatically filling in the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see Dedrick, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claims 20 and 47, Dedrick teaches wherein the utilizing step includes:
formulating search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device; and executing a search based on the search requirements using the heuristics algorithms (see column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 21 and 48, Dedrick teaches wherein the search requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device (see column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 22 and 49, Dedrick teaches further comprising the step of: providing a graphical user interface (GUI) for allowing the user to organize the meta data collection (see column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-31).

As to claim 28, Dedrick teaches a computer program product embodied on computer readable medium readable by at least one of a computing device and a central repository subsystem, for managing meta data using a central repository at the central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by the computing device through a communication network (see abstract), the computer program product comprising computer executable instructions for:

connecting, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

utilizing, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

As to claim 55, Dedrick teaches a system for managing meta data in a secure manner (see abstract), the system comprising:

a central repository subsystem including a central repository for storing a plurality of segments associated with a user in a collection order (see column 9, lines 57-65); and

at least one computing device capable of communicating with the central repository subsystem through a communications network, the computing device including a local repository and being capable of connecting, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21), updating the local repository with at least one of the segments from the central repository to produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29), and utilizing the meta data collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

As to claim 77, Dedrick teaches further comprising: a meta data editor for allowing the user to organize the meta data collection. (see column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-31).

As to claim 83, Dedrick teaches wherein at least one of the central repository and the local repository is implemented using a network-attached storage (see column 3, lines 7-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2175

8. Claims 5-6, 32-33, and 60-61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448).

As to claims 5, 32, and 60, Dedrick does not teach wherein the authentication information includes user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem.

Nguyen teaches secure communication sessions on a network (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the authentication information includes user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem (see column 16, lines 13-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the authentication information includes user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Nguyen because wherein the authentication information includes user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem would prevent the password from being transferred over the network and allow both the client and server to authenticate each other (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-16).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claims 6, 33, and 61, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the verifying step includes: determining a secret key represented as a hash of the received user identification concatenated with a hash of the received identifier encrypted with the received pass phrase; and comparing the secret key with a stored key associated with the user (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-33).

9. Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claims 7 and 34, Dedrick does not teach wherein the updating step includes:

determining if the local repository is at a null state;

first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state; and

second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches using a mobile profile to dynamically access programs, URLs, telephone numbers, television channels, and radio stations (see abstract) in which he teaches wherein the updating step includes: determining if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 38-65); first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state (see column 7, lines 52-65); and second requesting the

Art Unit: 2175

central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 44-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the updating step includes: determining if the local repository is at a null state; first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state; and second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Kim because wherein the updating step includes: determining if the local repository is at a null state; first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates that the local repository is not at a null state; and second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see column 7, lines 38-65).

As to claims 8 and 35, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further includes:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said first requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer); and

applying the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

As to claims 9 and 36, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further includes:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said second requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer); and

generating the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

10. Claims 12, 14-16, 39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287).

As to claims 12 and 39, Dedrick teaches wherein the utilizing step further includes:

continuously collecting meta data resulting from use of the computing device during the current user session at the computing device (see column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick does not teach the method further comprises:

generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and
processing the new segment.

Bull et al. teaches aggregation and synthesization of information (see abstract), in which he teaches the method further comprises: generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and processing the new segment (see column 4, lines 28-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the method further comprises: generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and processing the new segment.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Bull et al. because the method further comprises: generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session; and processing the new segment would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claims 14 and 41, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data includes application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and

Art Unit: 2175

context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the utilizing step further includes:

determining statistical information associated with the meta data, the statistical information indicating relationships between the meta data, wherein the retrieving step is performed in part based on the statistical information (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12).

As to claims 15 and 42, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claims 16 and 43, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the application data include at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

11. Claims 13 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287) as applied to claims 12, 14-16, 39, and 41-43 above, and further in view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claims 13 and 40 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the processing step includes:

updating the meta data collection with the new segment if said meta data collection exists in the local repository (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

Dedrick as modified, does not teach storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository.

Kim teaches storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository (see column 7, lines 44-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Kim because storing the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if said meta data collection does not exist in the local repository would initiate the user profile in the local database (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51).

12. Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claims 18 and 45, Dedrick does not teach wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further includes:

retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and

presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

Mohan et al. teaches a client-server independent intermediary system (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further includes: retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration (see column 11, lines 7-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further includes: retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Mohan et al. because wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further includes: retrieving, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or fill in items

Art Unit: 2175

that are not in the normally found in the user's profile without having to delete or fill in the items every time a particular form is filled out (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6).

13. Claims 19 and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claims 19 and 46, Dedrick does not teach wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step includes:

presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format;
determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and
presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches an intelligent data securing apparatus (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step includes: presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password (see page 5, paragraph 0050).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the current context is

for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step includes: presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Chun et al. because wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step includes: presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password would give the user the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., page 5, paragraph 0050).

14. Claims 23 and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,636,246 B1).

As to claims 23 and 50, Dedrick does not teach wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection (see column 5, lines 18-33).

Art Unit: 2175

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Nagahara et al. because wherein the GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see Nagahara et al., abstract).

As to claim 78, Dedrick does not teach wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection (see column 5, lines 18-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Nagahara et al. because wherein the meta data editor displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data collection would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see Nagahara et al., abstract).

Art Unit: 2175

15. Claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of “Net Securty Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further”.

As to claims 26 and 53, Dedrick does not teach wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module.

“Net Securty Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” teaches wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module (see page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of “Net Securty Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” because wherein the computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing step is performed by a CDSA add-on module would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into multiple applications (see “Net

Art Unit: 2175

Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further”, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 58, Dedrick teaches wherein the computing device further includes:

a plurality of applications selectably executable on the computing device (see column 5, lines 52-67);

a data repository module, provided as an add-in module to the security-service providing architecture, for utilizing the meta data collection to assist the user in using the computing device (see Figure 8, step 306); and

an encryption/decryption module for encryption any new segment to be transmitted to the central repository subsystem (see column 6, line 35 through column 7, line 8).

Dedrick does not teach a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications.

“Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” teaches a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications (see page 1, paragraphs 3-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications.

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” because a security-service providing architecture structure for selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into multiple applications (see “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further”, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 65, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module retrieves using heuristics algorithms, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for a current context of using the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and transmits the retrieved meta data to an appropriate one of the applications which in turn applies the retrieved meta data in the current context (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claim 66, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context includes at least one of the following: opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a computer file, or executing an application program (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40 through column 8, line 23).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 72, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and said appropriate one of the applications automatically fills the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see Dedrick, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claim 75, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module formulates search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device, and executes a search based on the search requirements using the heuristics algorithms (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claim 76, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the search requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, line 9, through column 8, line 31).

As to claim 81, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the computing device is configured in Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the data repository module is an add-on module to the CDSA configuration (see "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further" page 1, paragraphs 1-2).

16. Claims 27, 54, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1).

As to claims 27, 54, and 82, Dedrick does not teach wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols.

Charisius et al. teaches wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols (see page 1, paragraph 0010).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick by the teachings of Charisius et al. because wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols because wherein the central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols would allow multiple users to view the same workflow and project plans, provide persistent storage, monitor the progress of an activated project plan, and simultaneously create plans from the same workflow (see Charisius et al., page 1, paragraph 0010).

17. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claim 62, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state, transmits a first request to the central

Art Unit: 2175

repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state, and transmits a second request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 38-65), transmits a first request to the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state (see column 7, lines 52-65), and transmits a second request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state (see column 7, lines 44-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state, transmits a first request to the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state, and transmits a second request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Kim because wherein the data repository module determines if the local repository is at a null state, transmits a first request to the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the local repository is not at a null state, and

Art Unit: 2175

transmits a second request to the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated with the user if the local repository is at a null state would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see Kim, column 7, lines 38-65).

As to claim 63, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the encryption/decryption module receives at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said first request (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65), and decrypts the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer), and wherein the data repository module applies the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

As to claim 64, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the encryption/decryption module receives at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said second request (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51), and decrypts the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29, where it is inherent that the encrypted information is decrypted when it gets to the local computer), and wherein the data repository module generates the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

Art Unit: 2175

18. Claims 67 and 69-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287).

As to claim 67, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module continuously collects meta data resulting from use of the computing device during the current user session at the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick as modified, still does not teach generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session.

Bull et al. teaches generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session (see column 4, lines 28-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified by the teachings of Bull et al. because generates a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the current user session would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

As to claim 69, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data includes application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the data repository module determines statistical information associated with the meta data and retrieves said appropriate meta data based on the statistical information, the statistical information indicating relationships between the meta data (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12).

As to claim 70, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claim 71, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the application data include at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

19. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further" in further view of Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287) as applied to claims 67 and 69-72 above, and further in view of Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claim 68, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the data repository module updates the meta data collection with the new segment if the meta data collection exists in the local repository (see Bull et al., column 4, lines 28-33).

Dedrick as modified, does not teach stores the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if the meta data collection does not exist in the local repository.

Kim teaches stores the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if the meta data collection does not exist in the local repository (see column 7, lines 44-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include stores the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if the meta data collection does not exist in the local repository.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Kim because stores the new segment in the local repository as a meta data collection for the user if the meta data collection does not exist in the local repository would initiate the user profile in the local database (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51).

20. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of "Net Securty Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53,

Art Unit: 2175

58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and further in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claim 73, Dedrick as modified, does not teach wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

Mohan et al. teaches wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration (see column 11, lines 7-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Mohan et al. because wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the data repository

Art Unit: 2175

module retrieves, from the meta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form, and transmits the alternative meta data to said appropriate one of the applications which in turn presents the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or fill in items that are not in the normally found in the user's profile without having to delete or fill in the items every time a particular form is filled out (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6).

21. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further" as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and in further view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claim 74, Dedrick as modified, still does not teach wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and

Art Unit: 2175

wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password (see page 5, paragraph 0050).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Chun et al. because wherein the current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data includes a user identification and a password, and wherein the data repository module controls said appropriate one of the applications to present to the user the password in an obfuscated format, determines whether it is safe to present the actual password to the user, and controls said appropriate one of the applications to present the actual password in a non-obfuscated format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password would give the

Art Unit: 2175

user the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., page 5, paragraph 0050).

22. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of “Net Securty Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Compers for Everyone a Step Further” as applied to claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76, and 81 above, and further in view of Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,843 B1).

As to claim 84, Dedrick as modified, does not teach wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means.

Lim teaches integrating authentication and authorization mechanisms into an application access control system (see abstract) in which he teaches wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means (see column 8, lines 46-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, to include wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick as modified, by the teachings of Lim because wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a

Art Unit: 2175

predetermined connection means would access to remote servers through a common API (see column 7, lines 34-44).

Allowable Subject Matter

23. Claims 24-25, 51-52, and 79-80 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

24. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record; Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448), Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884), Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287 A), Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,184,884 B1), Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1), Chun et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0184527 A1), Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230), Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1), Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,884 B1), and “New Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce For Everyone a Step Further” (www.opengroup.org); does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the uploading step includes: temporarily locking the local repository; encrypting the new segment using an encryption key; transmitting the encrypted new segment from the

Art Unit: 2175

computing device to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository; and unlocking the local repository, as claimed in claim 24.

The prior art of record, Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448), Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5710884), Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287 A), Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No 6,184,884 B1), Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1), Chun et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0184527 A1), Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230), Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1, Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,884 B1), and “New Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce For Everyone a Step Further” (www.opengroup.org), does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the computer executable instructions for uploading include computer executable instructions for: temporarily locking the local repository; encrypting the new segment using an encryption key; transmitting the encrypted new segment from the computing device to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository; and unlocking the local repository, as claimed in claim 51.

The prior art of record, Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 5,638,448), Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5710884), Bull et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,901,287 A), Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No 6,184,884 B1), Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0077842 A1), Chun et al. (U.S. patent publication No. 2002/0184527 A1), Mohan et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,505,230), Kim (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1, Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,884 B1), and “New Security Standard from the

Art Unit: 2175

Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce For Everyone a Step Further”

(www.opengroup.org), does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the data repository module temporarily locks the local repository and creates the new segment based on collected meta data; the encryption/decryption module encrypts the new segment using an encryption key; and the data repository module transmits the encrypted new segment to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository and unlocks the local repository, as claimed in claim 79.

Claims 25, 52, and 80 are objected to because they are dependent from the objected to dependent claims 24, 51, and 79.

Conclusion

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2175

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jfb
29 Jul 2004



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER